

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 5-6 remain pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 8 stands objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as allegedly being a substantial duplicate of claim 7. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree, Applicant cancels claim 8. Accordingly, this objection is moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, Applicant amends the claims to eliminate the phrase "to be" thereby removing any alleged implication of future acts. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koji (JP 11-186008). Claims 1-3, 5 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Clark et al. (US 5,142,268). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, Applicant amends claim 1.

Amended claims 1 recites a surface mounting chip network component having an even number of network circuits formed on the surface of a rectangular insulating substrate. Each of the network circuits has three or more odd number of terminals with an equal number of the terminals arranged at each of the facing sides on said insulating substrate and elements of the network circuits are formed on both faces of the insulating substrate. Claim 1 also calls for an individual network circuit having a common conductor extending from a terminal on a side of the insulating substrate and one or more elements selected from: (a) a resistor connected to the common conductor at an edge; (b) another terminal on a side of the insulating substrate to which the other edge of the resistor is connected; (c) another resistor formed on the reverse side of the insulating substrate with respect to the face where the resistor of (a) is formed with an edge of the resistor connected to the terminal of (b); and (d) an independent terminal connectable to the other edge of the resistor of (c), the terminal being located on the opposite side of the insulating substrate with respect to the side of the insulating substrate where the terminal of (b) is arranged. Claim 1 further calls for all of the network circuits formed on the insulating substrate to be equivalent and for the terminals of the corresponding two network circuits to be arranged point-symmetrically with respect to a center of the surface of the insulating substrate.

According to the claimed arrangement, the surface mounting chip network component has network circuits on both faces of the insulating substrate. As such, it is possible to achieve miniaturization. Further, according to this arrangement, it is possible to exploit the miniaturization by enlarging each of the elements. This enhances the stability of the function of the elements. It is also easier to produce the surface

mounting chip network component. The claimed arrangement also makes it possible to produce a directly connected circuit on both circuits of the insulating substrate.

In contrast, Koji fails to teach or suggest network circuits on both faces of the insulating substrate. Clark fails to teach or suggest that all of the network circuits formed on the insulating substrate are equivalent and that the terminals of the corresponding two network circuits are arranged point-symmetrically with respect to a center of the surface of the insulating substrate.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2, 5 and 6 depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koji in view of Takeuchi et al. (US 6,005,474). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to its base claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 10 is canceled. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.


CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all stated grounds of rejection are properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the

Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response is made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 16, 2005

By: 
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/jmz